

REMARKS

The applicant has carefully considered the official action dated April 22, 2005, and the references it cites. In the official action, claims 5-30 were allowed. Accordingly, claims 5-30 are not discussed further herein. The official action rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. By way of this response, the applicant has amended claims 1-4 to clarify the scope of protection sought. No new matter has been added, and the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application.


The examiner contends that it is not clear what “data hazard” is related to and how it is prevented. The applicant respectfully submits that “data hazard” is a term that is well known in the art. Specifically, the background section of the application describes three examples of data hazards including a read-after-write (RAW) data hazard, a write-after-read (WAR) data hazard, and a write-after-write (WAW) data hazard. See page 1, lines 17-32. In a disclosed example, data hazards are prevented by tracking a pendency status of a memory resource and using the pendency status to manage access to the memory resource. See page 6, lines 9-10 and page 16, lines 7-26. Thus, it is clear what “data hazard” is related to and how it is prevented.

The applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, as amended, overcomes the indefiniteness rejection and is in condition for allowance. Claim 1 now recites tracking a pendency status of a memory resource based on an order of a first instruction response and a second instruction response, wherein the pendency status is used to manage access to the memory resource to prevent a data hazard. Support for tracking a pendency status can be found in the specification at least at page 9, lines 8-9. Support for using a pendency status to manage access to the memory resource to prevent a data hazard can be found at least at page

6, lines 9-10 and page 16, lines 7-26. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 and claims 2-4 dependent thereon are now in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, the applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining matters that the examiner would like to discuss, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark G. Hanley
Reg. No. 44,736
Attorney for Applicant
Hanley, Flight and Zimmerman, LLC
(at customer number 34431)
20 North Wacker Drive
Suite 4220
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312.580.1020

Dated: 7.19.05

Attorneys for Intel Corporation